



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

N✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,626	11/03/2003	Charles Matthew Erwin	4450-0409P	3403
2292	7590	10/12/2004		EXAMINER
		BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH		PRASAD, CHANDRIKA
		PO BOX 747		
		FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/698,626	ERWIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chandrika Prasad	2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The reply filed on 9/2/04 consists of amendments to claims 1-2, 8-9 and remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the shoulder a predetermined distance from the second end and two edges extending the length of the channel walls must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claims 1-15. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will

be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The shoulder a predetermined distance from the second end and two edges extending the length of the channel walls as recited in the independent claims 1, 2 and 9 have not been described in the specification.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the central channel" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in-
 - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
 - (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

9. ¹⁰² Claim 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kent et al. (US 6,554,489).

Kent (Figures 1-14) shows an optical fiber bending apparatus comprising a plurality of benders, each with a flexible tubular main body 22, having first end and a second end, a channel 23, 34 formed in the main body, the first end is capable receiving an optical fiber cable with a plurality of optical fibers and the second end is capable of receiving a connector boot. The optical fiber cable with a plurality of fibers placed in the channel flexes away from the chassis (chassis is not positively recited) and connected to an optical fiber connector. The parallel walls 30, 32a, 32b formed with the main body are formed with shoulder a predetermined distance from the ends over the length of these walls and extending a distance away from the walls. The benders bend the optical fibers substantially orthogonal from one end to the other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent et al. (US 6,554,489) in view of Rodgers (US 6,236,795).

For claim 4, but the number of fibers is not disclosed, a plurality of fibers in the cable is visible in figure 4 and for claim 4, each of the fiber bender is attachable to a single fiber or alternatively for claim 5, each of the connector 49 is connectable to two fibers. For claim 6, a connector boot 50a is also for claims 7 and 8, the benders are shown to be parallel in figure 10, however, it would be obvious to rotate one of the benders to bend the inserted fiber in opposite or 90 degree angle, also for claim 8, a plurality of shoulder is disclosed at 30, 32, 38, 238a, 338a, which is capable of being used for abutting inserted connector boot (connector boot is not positively recited in this claim).

12. Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent et al. (US 6,554,489) in view of Rodgers (US 6,236,795) and Brownjohn (US 5,212,751).

As discussed above, Kent et al. in view of Rodgers discloses claimed invention except for connecting optical fibers to optical transducer via male female connectors at

a faceplate. Brownjohn, in figure 1, discloses an optical connector with a transducer (column 3, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kent et al. as modified by Rodgers and further modify as taught by Brownjohn, so that optical signals can be converted into electrical signals. The fiber benders, LC connectors, arranging fibers and arranging benders upward or downward, as required, all are obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, so as to properly route the fibers in the device.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 9/02/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Kent does show parallel walls 30, 32a, 32b formed with the main body with shoulders a predetermined distance from the ends over the length of these walls and extending a distance away from the walls.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

15. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (571) 272-2099.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's art unit can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.



Chandrika Prasad
Primary examiner
October 4, 2004